

“Return on Federal investment for the National Estuary Programs [dollar value of “primary” leveraged resources (cash or inkind) divided by Section 320 funds].”

To enable the Coastal Management Branch to assess the ability of the NEPs to leverage their CWA Section 320 grants and earmarks, **each Region should report into ACS:**

the whole number of primary leveraged dollars (do not round off) obtained by the NEPs above and beyond the NEPs’ CWA section 320 grant and earmarks.

This data should be copied from the EPA’s National Estuary Program On-Line Reporting Tool (NEPORT). Specifically, the Regions should copy the HQ-approved NEP Primary Leveraged Dollars found in NEPORT. Please refer to the information below for further guidance on what should be counted. Please contact Tim Jones (jones.tim@epa.gov) if you have any questions.

Leveraging Role Definitions

“Primary role” indicates that the NEP played the central role in obtaining the leveraged resources. For example, the NEP convened a workgroup that created a stormwater utility or researched and wrote a grant proposal.

“Significant role” indicates that the NEP actively participated in but did not lead the effort to obtain additional resources. For example, the NEP wrote parts of a grant proposal or identified lands for habitat restoration.

“Support role” indicates the NEP played a minor role in channeling resources toward CCMP implementation. For example, the NEP wrote a letter of support for a partner grant application or included habitat acquisition as a CCMP action, but other entities raised funds and identified lands for acquisition.

Additional Leveraging Role Examples

Primary role indicates that the NEP played the central role in obtaining the leveraged resources. For example, the NEP:

- Wrote a grant proposal that helped fund the implementation of a CCMP action
- Solicited funds and in-kind support for NEP operations (e.g., office space)
- Provided funds to partners for use as match for grants that fund CCMP implementation

Significant role indicates that the NEP actively participated in but did not lead the effort to obtain additional resources. For example, the NEP:

- Wrote parts of a grant proposal that helped fund CCMP implementation
- Identified lands for habitat restoration that were restored using other sources of funding
- Directed other non-NEP resources (e.g., SEP money) to projects
- Established a program such as a local land trust that raised money for CCMP implementation
- Convened or actively participated in a stormwater utility workgroup that subsequently raised funds for CCMP implementation
- Provided seed money to support a larger project, such as a public event, but left additional fundraising to project sponsors.

Support role indicates the NEP played a minor role in channeling resources toward CCMP implementation. For example, the NEP:

- Wrote a letter in support of a partner's grant proposal.
- Included habitat acquisition as a CCMP action, but other entities raised funds and identified lands for acquisition